Application No. 10/734,811 Amendment dated May 7, 2007 After Decision on Appeal of March 7, 2007

REMARKS

Currently claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17, and 18 stand rejected over WO 01/52106 A2 to Sarid Gal (referred to hereinafter as Gal).

It is clear from the specification that the e-mail that is mentioned in connection with the described embodiment relates to a messaging system in which electronic messages are sent to electronic mailboxes of recipients where they are stored for later retrieval by those recipients when they use their computers to get online. The transmission of the electronic message is done asynchronously, i.e., contact is initiated by the sender and does not require the receipt by the sender of a specific request from a recipient or even that a connection to the recipient's computer be established before the message can be sent to that recipient.

In contrast, as pointed out in the Decision of the Board, "Gal's system stores the invitations in its database (shown in Figure 4) and then forwards the invitations to the recipient via the dynamically-created Web page (e-mail) when requested to do so by the recipient via the recipient's Web browser." In other words, Gal's system requires that a connection first be established with the sender's computer. More specifically, in Gal's system the client through its Web browser establishes a connection with the appropriate server. The Web browser then requests the transfer to the client's computer certain requested information which is displayed to the client via the client's browser interface.

The Board noted that appellants had failed to specify exactly what "type" of electronic communication through a computer qualifies as the claimed "e-mail." So, to remedy that we have added limitations to the claims that capture the type of e-mail that is discussed in the specification. More specifically, claim 1 now recites in relevant part:

wherein each of the plurality of members has a <u>corresponding electronic mailbox</u> for receiving electronic communications for storage and later retrieval by that member; for each of the plurality of members, detecting whether the invitee selection criteria for any of the events matches the member information for that member; and for each of the members for whom a match was detected, <u>asynchronously</u> sending an electronic <u>invitation message to that member's electronic mailbox</u>

Now that the claims more clearly define what was meant by e-mail, we submit that they now distinguish over Gal.

Amendment dated May 7, 2007

After Decision on Appeal of March 7, 2007

For the reasons stated above, we believe that the claims are allowable and therefore ask the Examiner to allow them to issue.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Dated: May 7, 2007

Eric L. Prahl

Registration No.: 32,590 Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP 60 State Street Boston, Massachusetts 02109 (617) 526-6000 (telephone) (617) 526-5000 (facsimile)